



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,707	12/16/2003	John W. Pettit	000049-00110	3452

27557 7590 04/19/2006

BLANK ROME LLP
600 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

KAO, CHIH CHENG G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2882

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/735,707

Applicant(s)

PETTIT, JOHN W.



Examiner

Chih-Cheng Glen Kao

Art Unit

2882

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-95 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-95 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 3/29/06. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 76 and 77 are objected to because of the following informalities, which appear to be minor draft errors including grammatical and/or lack of antecedent basis problems.

In the following format (location of objection; suggestion for correction), the following correction(s) may obviate the objection(s): (claim 76, last two lines, "such that high-voltage electron beam"; inserting - -the- - after "that").

Claim 77 is objected to by virtue of its dependency. For purposes of examination, the claims have been treated as such. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 9, 11, 12, 33, 40, 42-46, and 95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturm (US Patent 6377652) in view of Takahashi et al. (US Patent 6456691).

Art Unit: 2882

4. Regarding claims 1 and 95, Sturm discloses an apparatus and method comprising a radiation source for generating a beam of radiation (fig. 1, #10), and a solid state detector (col. 4, lines 40-41), disposed to intercept the beam of radiation (fig. 1, #44b) after the beam of radiation (fig. 1, #441) has been made incident on an object (fig. 1, #16), for detecting the beam of radiation and for outputting a signal (fig. 1, signal to #37) representing the beam of radiation.

However, Sturm does not disclose a cold cathode, comprising a carbon nanotube material, for emitting electrons and a target, in a path of the electrons emitted by the cold cathode, for emitting a beam of radiation when struck by the electrons, the cold cathode being controlled to emit the electrons such that the beam of radiation emitted by the target is stabilized.

Takahashi et al. teaches a cold cathode, comprising a carbon nanotube material (abstract, lines 1-4), for emitting electrons (col. 4, line 2) and a target (fig. 1, #16), in a path of the electrons emitted by the cold cathode (fig. 1, #14), for emitting a beam of radiation when struck by the electrons (col. 4, lines 6-9), the cold cathode being controlled to emit the electrons such that the beam of radiation emitted by the target is necessarily stabilized (col. 4, lines 50-53, and col. 5, lines 8-14).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the apparatus and method of Sturm with the cold cathode generator of Takahashi et al., since one would be motivated to make such a modification to reduce power (col. 1, lines 22-45, and col. 2, lines 5-10) as implied from Takahashi et al.

5. Regarding claims 2 and 33, Sturm further discloses a computing device (fig. 1, #40) for receiving the signal (fig 1, signal from #37) and for calculating and outputting, in accordance

Art Unit: 2882

with the signal, a numerical value representing a property (col. 9, lines 49-53) of the object (fig. 1, #16).

6. Regarding claims 9 and 40, Sturm further discloses wherein the radiation source (fig. 1, #10) and the detector (fig. 1, #22) are positioned relative to each other such that the detector (fig. 1, #22) receives the beam of radiation after the beam of radiation (fig. 1, #44b) has been transmitted through the object (fig. 1, #16).

7. Regarding claims 11 and 42, Sturm further discloses the radiation source (fig. 1, #14) and the detector (fig. 1, #24) positioned relative to each other such that the detector (fig. 1, #24) receives the beam of radiation (fig. 1, #44b) after the beam of radiation would necessarily have been side-scattered through the object (fig. 1, #16), due to scattering effects.

8. Regarding claims 12 and 43, Sturm further discloses wherein the detector comprises a first detector (fig. 1, #22) which is positioned relative to the radiation source (fig. 1, #10) such that the first detector (fig. 1, #22) receives a first portion of the beam of radiation after the first portion of the beam of radiation (fig. 1, #44b) has been transmitted through the object (fig. 1, #16), and a second detector (fig. 1, #24) which is positioned relative to the radiation source (fig. 1, #10) such that the second detector (fig. 1, #24) receives a portion of the beam of radiation after the second portion of the beam of radiation (fig. 1, #44b) would necessarily have been side-scattered through the object (fig. 1, #16), due to scattering effects.

Art Unit: 2882

9. Regarding claims 44-46, Sturm further discloses wherein the object comprises a sheet material, wherein the sheet material comprises paper, and wherein the paper is cigarette paper (fig. 1, #16, and col. 1, lines 30-31).

10. Claims 3, 4, 10, 17, 20-24, 28, 34, 35, 41, 61-64, 68, 70, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturm and Takahashi et al. as respectively applied to claims 1, 2, 13, and 33 above, and further in view of Allport (US Patent 4047029).

11. Regarding claims 10, 17, and 41, Sturm as modified above suggests an apparatus and method as recited above.

However, Sturm does not disclose a radiation source and detector positioned relative to each other such that the detector receives a beam of radiation after the beam of radiation has backscattered from the object.

Allport teaches a radiation source (fig. 1, #21) and detector (fig. 1, #25) positioned relative to each other such that the detector (fig. 1, #25) receives a beam of radiation after the beam of radiation has backscattered from the object (fig. 1, #13).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the apparatus and method of Sturm as modified above with the backscattering of Allport, since one would be motivated to make such a modification to reduce composition sensitivity issues (col. 2, lines 50-56, and col. 3, lines 10-15) as implied from Allport.

12. Regarding claims 20 and 61 and for purposes of being concise, Sturm as modified above suggests an apparatus and method as recited above.

However, Sturm does not disclose a roller assembly for moving a sheet of material such that a beam of radiation is incident on the sheet of material and such that the sheet of material moves past a source.

Allport teaches a roller assembly (fig. 1, to the left of #51) for moving a sheet of material (fig. 1, #13) such that a beam of radiation (fig. 1, from #21) is incident on the sheet of material (fig. 1, #13) and such that the sheet of material (fig. 1, #13) moves past a source (fig. 1, #21).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the apparatus and method of Sturm as modified above with the roller assembly of Allport, since one would be motivated to make such a modification to work faster (fig. 1) as implied from Allport.

13. Regarding claims 21 and 62, Sturm further discloses wherein the source (fig. 1, #10) and the detector (fig. 1, #22) are disposed to be on opposite sides of the sheet of material (fig. 1, #16), such that the beam of radiation (fig. 1, #44) is transmitted through the sheet of material (fig. 1, #16).

14. Regarding claim 22, Sturm further discloses a computing device (fig. 1, #40) for receiving the signal (fig 1, signal from #37) and for calculating and outputting, in accordance with the signal, a numerical value representing a property (col. 9, lines 49-53) of the object (fig. 1, #16).

15. Regarding claims 28 and 68, Sturm further discloses wherein the detector is a solid state detector (col. 4, lines 40-41).

16. Regarding claims 3, 4, 23, 24, 34, 35, 63, and 64, Sturm as modified above suggests an apparatus and method as recited above.

However, Sturm does not disclose calculating thickness or mass per unit area.

Allport teaches calculating thickness or mass per unit area (abstract, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the apparatus and method of Sturm as modified above with the calculating of Allport, since one would be motivated to make such a modification for measuring faster (col. 1, lines 5-30) as implied from Allport.

17. Regarding claims 70 and 71, Sturm further discloses wherein the object comprises a sheet material, wherein the sheet material comprises paper, and wherein the paper is cigarette paper (fig. 1, #16, and col. 1, lines 30-31).

18. Claims 5-7, 13-16, 18, 19, 25-27, 36-38, 49-58, and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturm, Takahashi et al., and Allport et al. as respectively applied to claims 2, 20, 33, and 61 above, and further in view of Hell et al. (US Patent 6178226).

19. Regarding claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 25, 26, 36, 37, 49, 50, 65, and 66 and for purposes of being concise, Sturm as modified above suggests an apparatus and method as recited above.

However, Sturm does not disclose wherein a computing device is connected to a radiation source to control the radiation source and is programmed to modulate a beam of radiation, wherein the computing device is programmed to modulate the beam of radiation and to analyze a signal, to achieve phase-locked detection.

Hell et al. teaches wherein a computing device is connected to a radiation source to control the radiation source and is programmed to modulate a beam of radiation (col. 3, lines 26-29), wherein the computing device is programmed to modulate the beam of radiation and to analyze a signal, to achieve phase-locked detection (col. 3, line 23).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the apparatus and method of Sturm as modified above with the phase-locked detection of Hell et al., since one would be motivated to make such a modification for better synchronization and a better signal (col. 3, lines 5-30) as implied from Hell et al.

20. Regarding claims 7, 15, 27, 38, 51, and 67, Sturm further discloses wherein the beam of radiation comprises soft x-rays (col. 6, lines 1-25).

21. Regarding claims 16 and 52, Sturm further discloses wherein the radiation source (fig. 1, #10) and the detector (fig. 1, #22) are positioned relative to each other such that the detector (fig.

Art Unit: 2882

1, #22) receives the beam of radiation after the beam of radiation (fig. 1, #44b) has been transmitted through the object (fig. 1, #16).

22. Regarding claims 18 and 54, Sturm further discloses the radiation source (fig. 1, #14) and the detector (fig. 1, #24) positioned relative to each other such that the detector (fig. 1, #24) receives the beam of radiation (fig. 1, #44b) after the beam of radiation would necessarily have been side-scattered through the object (fig. 1, #16), due to scattering effects.

23. Regarding claims 19 and 55, Sturm further discloses wherein the detector comprises a first detector (fig. 1, #22) which is positioned relative to the radiation source (fig. 1, #10) such that the first detector (fig. 1, #22) receives a first portion of the beam of radiation after the first portion of the beam of radiation (fig. 1, #44b) has been transmitted through the object (fig. 1, #16), and a second detector (fig. 1, #24) which is positioned relative to the radiation source (fig. 1, #10) such that the second detector (fig. 1, #24) receives a portion of the beam of radiation after the second portion of the beam of radiation (fig. 1, #44b) would necessarily have been side-scattered through the object (fig. 1, #16), due to scattering effects.

24. Regarding claim 53, Sturm as modified above suggests a method as recited above.

However, Sturm does not disclose receiving a beam of radiation after the beam of radiation has been backscattered from an object.

Allport teaches receiving (fig. 1, with #25) a beam of radiation (fig. 1, from #21) after the beam of radiation has been backscattered from an object (fig. 1, #13).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to further incorporate the method of Sturm as modified above with the backscattering of Allport, since one would be motivated to make such a modification to reduce composition sensitivity issues (col. 2, lines 50-56, and col. 3, lines 10-15) as implied from Allport.

25. Regarding claims 56-58, Sturm further discloses wherein the object comprises a sheet material, wherein the sheet material comprises paper, and wherein the paper is cigarette paper (fig. 1, #16, and col. 1, lines 30-31).

26. Claims 8, 29, 39, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturm, Takahashi et al., Allport et al., and Hell et al. as applied to claims 5, 28, 36, and 68 above, and further in view of Yokhin (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0150209).

Sturm as modified above suggests an apparatus and method as recited above.

However, Sturm does not disclose modulating a beam of radiation by turning the beam of radiation off and then on while an instrument operates, to determine, from a signal received while the beam of radiation is turned off, a leakage current of the detector, and to calibrate the detector in accordance with the leakage current.

Yokhin teaches modulating a beam of radiation by turning the beam of radiation off and then on while an instrument operates, to determine, from a signal received while the beam of radiation is turned off, a leakage current of the detector, and to calibrate the detector in accordance with the leakage current (paragraph 52).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the apparatus and method of Sturm as modified above with the leakage current calibration of Yokhin, since one would be motivated to make such a modification to obtain a more accurate signal without background noise (paragraph 52) as implied from Yokhin.

27. Claims 30, 31, 72, and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grodzins et al. (US Patent 6442233) in view of Takahashi et al.

28. Regarding claims 30 and 72, Grodzins et al. discloses an apparatus and method comprising a radiation source for generating a beam of radiation (fig. 2b, #10), a holder (fig. 2b, #18) for holding an object (fig. 2b, #24) in a path of the beam of radiation (fig. 2b, #10), and a detector (fig. 2b, #50), disposed to intercept the beam of radiation after the beam of radiation (fig. 2b, from #10) has been made incident on the object (fig. 2b, #24), for detecting the beam of radiation and for outputting a signal representing the beam of radiation (abstract).

However, Grodzins does not disclose a rod-shaped object, a cold cathode, comprising a carbon nanotube material, for emitting electrons, and a target, in a path of the electrons emitted by the cold cathode, for emitting a beam of radiation when struck by the electrons, the cold cathode being controlled to emit the electrons such that the beam of radiation emitted by the target is stabilized.

Takahashi et al. teaches a cold cathode, comprising a carbon nanotube material (abstract, lines 1-4), for emitting electrons (col. 4, line 2) and a target (fig. 1, #16), in a path of the

Art Unit: 2882

electrons emitted by the cold cathode (fig. 1, #14), for emitting a beam of radiation when struck by the electrons (col. 4, lines 6-9), the cold cathode being controlled to emit the electrons such that the beam of radiation emitted by the target is necessarily stabilized (col. 4, lines 50-53, and col. 5, lines 8-15).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the apparatus and method of Grodzins et al. with the cold cathode generator of Takahashi et al., since one would be motivated to make such a modification to reduce power (col. 1, lines 22-45, and col. 2, lines 5-10) as implied from Takahashi et al.

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the apparatus and method of Grodzins et al. with a rod-shaped object, since such a modification would have only involved a mere change in the shape of a component, which would generally be recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. One would be motivated to make such a modification to inspect for contraband of any shape.

29. Regarding claims 31 and 73, Grodzins et al. further discloses wherein the detector comprises a first detector (fig. 2b, #50), which is positioned relative to the radiation source (fig. 2b, for #10) such that the first detector (fig. 2b, #50) receives a first portion of the beam of radiation after the first portion of the beam of radiation has been transmitted through the object (fig. 2b, #24), and a second detector (fig. 2b, #88), which is positioned relative to a radiation source (fig. 2b, for #10) such that the second detector (fig. 2b, #88) receives a second portion of

Art Unit: 2882

the beam of radiation after the second portion of the beam of radiation has been side-scattered through the object (fig. 2b, #24).

30. Claims 32 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grodzins et al. and Takahashi et al. as applied to claims 31 and 72 above, and further in view of Averitt et al. (US Patent 4152591).

Grodzins et al. as modified above suggests an apparatus and method as recited above.

However, Grodzins et al. does not disclose solid state detectors.

Averitt et al. teaches solid state detectors (col. 1, lines 32-40).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the apparatus and method of Grodzins et al. as modified above with the solid state detectors of Averitt et al., since one would be motivated to make such a modification for making a device more compact (col. 1, lines 32-40) as implied from Averitt et al.

31. Claims 33, 47, 48, 72, and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torai et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0141535) in view of Takahashi et al.

32. Regarding claims 33 and 72, Torai et al. discloses a method comprising generating a beam of radiation (fig. 1, from #20), causing the beam of radiation to be incident on an object (fig. 1, object in #11), detecting the beam of radiation using a solid-state detector (fig. 1, #30,

Art Unit: 2882

and col. 4, lines 40-41) and outputting a signal, and performing a measurement on an object in accordance with the signal to determine a property of the object (paragraph 44).

However, Torai et al. does not disclose emitting electrons from a carbon nanotube material, causing the electrons to be incident on a target, emitting a beam of radiation from the target, and controlling the carbon nanotube material to emit the electrons such that the beam of radiation emitted by the target is stabilized.

Takahashi et al. teaches emitting electrons from a carbon nanotube material (abstract, lines 1-4), causing the electrons (col. 4, line 2) to be incident on a target (fig. 1, #16), emitting a beam of radiation from the target (col. 4, lines 6-9), and controlling the carbon nanotube material to emit the electrons such that the beam of radiation emitted by the target is necessarily stabilized (col. 4, lines 50-53, and col. 5, lines 8-15).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the method of Torai et al. with the carbon nanotube generator of Takahashi et al., since one would be motivated to make such a modification to reduce power (col. 1, lines 22-45, and col. 2, lines 5-10) as implied from Takahashi et al.

33. Regarding claims 47, 48, and 75, Torai et al. further discloses wherein the object comprises a rod, and wherein the rod is a cigarette rod (paragraph 1).

34. Claims 49, 59, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torai et al. in view of Takahashi et al. and Yokhin.

Art Unit: 2882

For purposes of being concise, Torai et al. as modified above suggests a method as recited above. Torai et al. further discloses wherein the object comprises a rod, and wherein the rod is a cigarette rod (paragraph 1).

However, Torai et al. does not disclose modulating a beam of radiation.

Yokhin teaches modulating a beam of radiation (paragraph 52).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the method of Torai et al. as modified above with the modulating of Yokhin, since one would be motivated to make such a modification to obtain a more accurate signal without background noise (paragraph 52) as implied from Yokhin.

35. Claims 76-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wideröe (US Patent 2798177) in view of Takahashi et al.

36. Regarding claims 76 and 78, Wideröe discloses a method and device comprising emitting electrons from a cathode (col. 2, lines 25-30), and accelerating the electrons through magnetic induction to form a high-voltage electron beam (col. 1, lines 15-20).

However, Wideröe does not disclose emitting electrons from a carbon nanotube material, the carbon nanotube cathode being controlled to emit the electrons such that a high-voltage electron beam is stabilized.

Takahashi et al. teaches emitting electrons from a carbon nanotube material (abstract, lines 1-4), the carbon nanotube cathode being controlled to emit the electrons such that a high-voltage electron beam is stabilized (col. 4, lines 50-53, and col. 5, lines 8-15).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the method and device of Wideröe with the carbon nanotube generator of Takahashi et al., since one would be motivated to make such a modification to reduce power (col. 1, lines 22-45, and col. 2, lines 5-10) as implied from Takahashi et al.

37. Regarding claims 77 and 79, Wideröe further discloses causing the electrons to enter a region of a magnetic field, and increasing the magnetic field to cause the electrons to gain energy (col. 1, lines 15-27).

38. Claims 80-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohno et al. (US Patent 5598451) in view of Takahashi et al.

39. Regarding claim 80, Ohno et al. discloses a method comprising emitting electrons, and causing the electrons to be incident on a target for emitting a beam of radiation when struck by the electrons (col. 2, lines 17-19), wherein the target or an intervening layer is selected to narrow a range of output energies of the beam of radiation (figs. 1-8).

However, Ohno et al. does not disclose emitting electrons from a cathode comprising carbon nanotube material, wherein the cathode is controlled to emit the electrons such that a beam of radiation emitted by a target is stabilized.

Takahashi et al. teaches emitting electrons from a cathode comprising carbon nanotube material (abstract, lines 1-4), wherein the cathode is controlled to emit the electrons such that a

Art Unit: 2882

beam of radiation emitted by a target is necessarily stabilized (col. 4, lines 50-53, and col. 5, lines 8-15).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the method of Ohno et al. with the carbon nanotube generator of Takahashi et al., since one would be motivated to make such a modification to reduce power (col. 1, lines 22-45, and col. 2, lines 5-10) as implied from Takahashi et al.

40. Regarding claims 81 and 82, Ohno et al. further discloses wherein the beam of radiation (fig. 10, #3b) is made incident on an object (fig. 10, object in #5) to make a stabilized measurement of a characteristic of the object (fig. 9), and wherein the range of output energies is selected to select a fluorescence emission (col. 2, lines 53-60) of a material in the object (fig. 9).

41. Claims 80 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer (US Patent 5280513) in view of Takahashi et al.

Meltzer discloses a method comprising emitting a beam of radiation (fig. 3, #6), wherein a target or an intervening layer is selected to narrow a range of output energies of the beam of radiation (col. 6, lines 41-49), and wherein the beam of radiation (fig. 3, #6) is made incident on an object (fig. 3, #16), backscattered radiation (fig. 3, #7) from the object (fig. 3, #16) is detected (fig. 3, #9), and the range of output energies is used to distinguish the backscattered radiation from spurious radiation (col. 6, lines 41-49).

However, Meltzer does not disclose emitting electrons from a cathode comprising carbon nanotube material, wherein the cathode is controlled to emit the electrons such that a beam of radiation emitted by a target is stabilized.

Takahashi et al. teaches emitting electrons from a cathode comprising carbon nanotube material (abstract, lines 1-4), wherein the cathode is controlled to emit the electrons such that a beam of radiation emitted by a target is necessarily stabilized (col. 4, lines 50-53, and col. 5, lines 8-15).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the method of Meltzer with the carbon nanotube generator of Takahashi et al., since one would be motivated to make such a modification to reduce power (col. 1, lines 22-45, and col. 2, lines 5-10) as implied from Takahashi et al.

42. Claims 84 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer and Takahashi et al. as applied to claim 83 above, and further in view of MacKenzie (US Patent 6252930).

Meltzer as modified above suggests a method as recited above.

However, Meltzer does not disclose wherein an object comprises a substrate with a coating on the substrate, wherein backscattered radiation from the object is detected to measure the coating, and wherein the coating comprises paint.

MacKenzie teaches wherein an object comprises a substrate with a coating on the substrate, wherein backscattered radiation (title) from the object is detected to measure the coating, and wherein the coating comprises paint (abstract, lines 6-7).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the method of Meltzer as modified above with measuring of MacKenzie, since one would be motivated to make such a modification to reduce costs (col. 1, lines 32-42) as implied from MacKenzie.

43. Claims 86-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faust (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0218714) in view of Takahashi et al. and Averitt.

44. Regarding claim 86, Faust discloses a method comprising generating a beam of radiation, causing the beam of radiation (fig. 1, #102) to be incident on an object (fig. 1, #105) to generate Compton backscattered radiation (fig. 1, #104, and paragraph 35), detecting the Compton backscattered radiation (fig. 1, #104) using a detector and outputting a signal, and detecting the object in accordance with the signal.

However, Faust does not disclose emitting electrons from a carbon nanotube material, causing the electrons to be incident on a target and emitting a beam of radiation from the target, or a solid state detector, wherein the carbon nanotube material is controlled to emit the electrons such that the beam of radiation is stabilized.

Takahashi et al. teaches emitting electrons from a carbon nanotube material (abstract, lines 1-4), causing the electrons to be incident on a target (fig. 1, #16) and emitting a beam of radiation from the target (fig. 1, #16), wherein the carbon nanotube material is controlled to emit the electrons such that the beam of radiation is necessarily stabilized (col. 4, lines 50-53, and col. 5, lines 8-15). Averitt et al. teaches a solid state detector (col. 1, lines 32-40).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the method of Faust with the carbon nanotube generator of Takahashi et al., since one would be motivated to make such a modification to reduce power (col. 1, lines 22-45, and col. 2, lines 5-10) as implied from Takahashi et al.

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the method of Faust with the solid state detector of Averitt et al., since one would be motivated to make such a modification for making a device more compact (col. 1, lines 32-40) as implied from Averitt et al.

45. Regarding claims 87-89, Faust would necessarily have detection in accordance with differences in atomic weights between a first and second material (paragraph 30), due to the interaction of radiation with the materials, wherein the first material comprises an explosive material (paragraph 2, "APL"), and wherein the second material comprises soil (fig. 1, #107).

46. Claim 90 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faust, Takahashi et al., and Averitt as applied to claim 88 above, and further in view of Uhm (US Patent 5410575).

Faust as modified above suggests a method as recited above.

However, Faust does not disclose wherein a second material comprises a sea bed.

Uhm teaches wherein a second material comprises a sea bed (fig. 1).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the method of Faust as modified above with the sea bed

Art Unit: 2882

detection of Uhm, since one would be motivated to make such a modification for better finding explosives underwater (col. 1, lines 5-10) as shown by Uhm to prevent harm.

47. Claims 91-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faust, Takahashi et al., and Averitt as applied to claim 87 above, and further in view of Norton (US Patent 5430787).

Faust as modified above suggests a method as recited above.

However, Faust does not disclose inspecting a first material comprising metal and a second material comprising cement, wherein an object is a reinforcing rod in a cement structure.

Norton teaches inspecting a first material comprising metal and a second material comprising cement, wherein an object is a reinforcing rod in a cement structure (col. 6, line 45).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the method of Faust as modified above with cement structure inspection of Norton, since one would be motivated to make such a modification to better analyze a structure (fig. 1) as implied from Norton.

48. Claims 91 and 94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faust, Takahashi et al., and Averitt as applied to claim 87 above, and further in view of Cambier et al. (US Patent 5202932).

Faust as modified above suggests a method as recited above.

However, Faust does not disclose inspecting a first material comprising metal, and wherein an object is a metal shaving in a food product.

Cambier et al. teaches inspecting a first material comprising metal, and wherein an object is a metal shaving in a food product (col. 1, lines 20-30).

It would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the method of Faust as modified above with the metal shaving inspection of Cambier et al., since one would be motivated to make such a modification for more safety (col. 1, lines 20-42) as implied from Cambier et al.

Response to Arguments

49. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-95 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's arguments filed 3/29/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument regarding the substitution of a carbon nanotube cold cathode device for a conventional heated filament hot cathode x-ray tube not being obvious, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art (i.e., lower power, low temperature, etc. of Takahashi et al.) cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. Therefore, applicant's arguments are not persuasive, and the claims remain rejected.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).



Art Unit: 2882

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chih-Cheng Glen Kao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2492. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F (9 am to 5 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Glick can be reached on (571) 272-2490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


gk
EDWARD J. GLICK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



100




FIG. 1A




FIG. 1B




FIG. 1C

Approved
4/19/06

2/5

FIG. 1D





FIG. 1E



Approved
4/13/06

3/5





FIG. 2B



Approved
&
4/15/06

FIG. 2D





FIG. 2C



Approved
4/19/06

5/5




FIG. 3





FIG. 4

Approved
at
4/19/06